

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/539,054	06/15/2005	Hiroshi Yokoyama	1806.1007	4255	
21171 7590 12/10/2009 STAAS & HALSEY LLP			EXAMINER		
SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			HEINCER, LIAM J		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	- ,		1796		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			12/10/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

 Application No.
 Applicant(s)

 10/539,054
 YOKOYAMA ET AL.

 Examiner
 Art Unit

 Liam J. Heincer
 1796

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) Liam J. Heincer. (2) Mark Henry. (3)		Liam J. Heincer	1796					
(2) Mark Henry. (4) Date of Interview: 03 December 2009. Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 1-4.9-11 and 14-16. Identification of prior art discussed: prior art of record. Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant argued the failure of others in producing the claimed invention, and the difficulty a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have had in combining the processes of Kato and Scardino. The position of the examiner was that there was not sufficient evidence of record to stabilish the claimed nolecular weight disturbed and Exalue would be achieved by the combined processes of Kato and Scardino. The applicant and Exalue would be achieved by the combined processes of Kato and Scardino. The applicant further argued that Kato does not teach the particular catalyst system. The examiner pointed to teachings in Kato that explicitly teach the phosphorous/tilanium system in the claimed ratio. The examiner pointed to teachings in Kato that explicitly teach the phosphorous/tilanium system in the claimed ratio. The examiner agreed that the specific in catalysts presented innewly presented claim 16 were not taught by the references currently applied, but further search was needed to determine patentability. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which the summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply	All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):							
Date of Interview: (33 December 2009. Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 1-4.9-11 and 14-16. Identification of prior art discussed: prior art of record. Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant arqued the failure of others in producing the claimed invention, and the difficulty a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have had in combining the processes of Kato and Scardino. The position of the examiner was that there was not sufficient evidence of record to stabilish the claimed and diffluct). The applicant further arqued that the molecular weight bittoin and E value would be achieved by the combined processes of Kato and Scardino. The applicant and E value would be achieved by the combined processes of Kato and Scardino. The applicant further arqued that Kato does not teach the particular catalyst system. The examiner pointed to teachings in Kato that explicitly teach the phosphorous/tilanium system in the claimed ratio. The examiner agreed that the specific in catalysts presented innewly presented claim 16 were not taught by the references currently applied, but further search was needed to determine patentability. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available	(1) <u>Liam J. Heincer</u> .	(3)						
Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal (copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description:	(2) Mark Henry.	(4)						
c) Personal (copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative) Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description:	Date of Interview: <u>03 December 2009</u> .							
If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 1-4,9-11 and 14-16. Identification of prior art discussed: prior art of record. Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant argued the failure of others in producing the claimed invention, and the difficulty a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have had in combining the processes of Kato and Scardino. The position of the examiner was that there was not sufficient evidence of record to stabilish the long felt need and diffuctive. The applicant further argued that the molecular weight historian and E value ware not taught by the references. The position of the examiner was that the original specification appears to indicate that the claimed nolecular weight and E value would be achieved by the combined processes of Kato and Scardino. The applicant further argued that Kato does not teach the particular catalyst system. The examiner pointed to teachings in Kato that explicitly teach the phosphorous/titanium system in the claimed ratio. The examiner agreed that the specific lin catalysts presented innewly presented claim 16 were not taught by the references currently applied, but further search was needed to determine patentability. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW See Summary of Record of Interview	Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)⊡ Video Conference c)⊡ Personal [copy given to: 1)⊡ applicant	2)☐ applicant's representative]					
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) NA. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant argued the failure of others in producing the claimed invention, and the difficulty a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have had in combining the processes of Kato and Scardino. The position of the examiner was that there was not sufficient evidence of record to establish the long fell need and difficulty. The applicant further argued that the molecular weight air stabilish the long fell need and difficulty. The applicant further argued that the molecular weight air specification appears to indicate that the claimed molecular weight and E value would be achieved by the combined processes of Kato and Scardino. The applicant further argued that the process of the process of the analysis of the examiner was that the original specification appears to indicate that the claimed molecular weight and E value would be achieved by the combined processes of Kato and Scardino. The applicant further argued that Kato does not teach the particular catalyst system. The examiner pointed to leachings in Kato that explicitly teach the phosphorous/tilanium system in the claimed ratio. The examiner agreed that the specific in catalysts presented innewly presented claim 16 were not taught by the references currently applied, but further search was needed to determine patentability. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, must be attached. The		e)⊠ No.						
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The <u>applicant arqued the failure of others in producing the claimed invention, and the difficulty a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have had in combining the processes of Kato and Scardino. The position of the examiner was that there was not sufficient evidence of record to stabilish the long fell need and difficulty. The applicant further arqued that the molecular weight distution and E value are not taught by the references. The position of the examiner was that the original specification appears to indicate that the claimed nolecular weight and E value would be achieved by the combined processes of Kato and Scardino. The applicant further arqued that Kato does not teach the particular catalyst system. The examiner pointed to teachings in Kato that explicitly teach the phosphorous/titanium system in the claimed ratio. The examiner agreed that the specific tin catalysts presented innewly presented claim 16 were not taught by the references currently applied, but further search was needed to determine patentability. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a rep</u>	Claim(s) discussed: <u>1-4,9-11 and 14-16</u> .							
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant argued the failure of others in producing the claimed invention, and the difficulty a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have had in combining the processes of Kato and Scardino. The position of the examiner was that there was not sufficient evidence of record to stabilish the long felt need and diffuctly. The applicant further argued that the molecular weight distinction and E value are not taught by the references. The position of the examiner was that the original specification appears to indicate that the claimed nolecular weight and E value would be achieved by the combined processes of Kato and Scardino. The applicant further argued that Kato does not teach the particular catalyst system. The examiner pointed to teachings in Kato that explicitly teach the phosphorous/titanium system in the claimed ratio. The examiner agreed that the specific tin catalysts presented innewly presented claim 16 were not taught by the references currently applied, but further search was needed to determine patentability. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable is available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been flied, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW See Summary of Record of Intelled Substances.	Identification of prior art discussed: prior art of record.							
reached, or any other comments: The applicant argued the failure of others in producing the claimed invention, and the difficulty a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have had in combining the processes of Kato and Scardino. The position of the examiner was that there was not sufficient evidence of record to establish the long felt need and diffucity. The applicant further argued that the molecular weight distribution and E value are not taught by the references. The position of the examiner was that the original specifican appears to indicate that the claimed molecular weight and E value would be achieved by the combined processes of Kato and Scardino. The applicant further argued that Kato does not teach the particular catalyst system. The examiner pointed to teachings in Kato that explicitly teach the phosphorous/titanium system in the claimed ratio. The examiner agreed that the specific tin catalysts presented innewly presented claim 16 were not taught by the references currently applied, but further search was needed to determine patentability. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW. Or Record of 11 the SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW SUBMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMEN TO FTHE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW SOE see Summary of Record of Interview	Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was reached.	g)⊠ was not reached. h)□ N	I/A.					
/Mark Eashoo/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796	reached, or any other comments: The applicant argued the failure of others in producing the claimed invention, and the difficulty a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have had in combining the processes of Kato and Scardino. The position of the examiner was that there was not sufficient evidence of record to establish the long felt need and difficity. The applicant further argued that the molecular weight distribution and E value are not taught by the references. The position of the examiner was that the original specifican appears to indicate that the claimed molecular weight and E value would be achieved by the combined processes of Kato and Scardino. The applicant further argued that Kato does not teach the particular catalyst system. The examiner pointed to teachings in Kato that explicitly teach the phosphorous/titanium system in the claimed ratio. The examiner agreed that the specific thin catalysts presented innewly presented claim 16 were not taught by the references currently applied, but further search was needed to determine patentability. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.							

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record
A complete written statement as to the substance of any factor-bace, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application where or not an apprenent with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135, (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patient of Trademark Office should be Iransacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attomeys or agents at the Patient and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patient and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant of the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the interview Summay Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

- A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:
 - 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the
- Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
 - (The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully
 - describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.